



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Our Case No. P93-00-DD)

In the Application of:

James D. Bennett
Lawrence M. Jarvis

Serial No.: 09/332,317

Filed: June 14, 1999

For: ATTORNEY TERMINAL HAVING
OUTLINE PREPARATION
CAPABILITIES FOR MANAGING
TRIAL PROCEEDINGS

Examiner: Elisca, Pierre E.

Group Art Unit: 3621

Confirmation No.: 2769

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on December 13, 2005.

By: Ronald Spuhler
Ronald Spuhler
Reg. No. 52,245

**REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114, RESPONSE
TO OFFICE ACTION AND REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW**

Mail Stop Petition
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

After receiving a Supplemental Office Action, Applicants' attorney had an interview with the Examiner. During this interview, Applicants' attorney argued that the art of record does not provide the basis for a proper obviousness rejection for several reasons, including the fact that the cited art does not relate in any way to a testimonial proceeding. While the Examiner did not disagree that the art of record does not relate to testimonial proceedings, per the Examiner's

request, Applicants amended their claims to further define that a testimonial proceeding relates to a proceeding in which a court reporter is present, such as a deposition or court proceeding.

The Examiner responded to Applicants' submission by noting that the amendments raised new issues that would require an additional search. As such, Applicants reiterate their previous amendments and respectfully request continued examination of the present application to allow the Examiner the opportunity to conduct a detailed search.